

# LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

**PROGRAM:**

Legislative Oversight

**PROGRAM ELEMENT:**
**PROGRAM MISSION:**

To assist the County Council in performing its legislative oversight function by providing accurate information, unbiased analysis, and independent recommendations

**COMMUNITY OUTCOMES SUPPORTED:**

- Enhance County Council decisionmaking on budget, legislative, and other policy matters
- Ensure high-value services for tax dollars
- Increase public awareness and confidence in the Council's deliberations and in agency operations

**PROGRAM MEASURES**

	FY01 ACTUAL	FY02 ACTUAL	FY03 ACTUAL	FY04 BUDGET	FY04 ACTUAL	FY05 APPROVED
--	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	------------------

**Outcomes/Results:**

Percentage of key recommendations adopted by the County Council and implemented <sup>a</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	TBD
--	----	----	----	----	----	-----

**Service Quality:**

Percentage of individuals reporting satisfaction with the quality of Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) reports	99	93	89	95	98	95
Percentage of individuals reporting satisfaction with their working relationship with OLO staff	NA <sup>b</sup>	98	100	95	98	95
Percentage of new Work Program projects completed within one month of initial target date <sup>c</sup>	80	83	75	90	88	90

**Efficiency:**

Cost per final report submitted (\$000) <sup>d</sup>	53	49	55	72	61	73
Percentage of staff time spent on Work Program assignments	82	84	86	85	90	85

**Workload/Outputs:**

Number of final reports submitted to Council	11	12	12	10	11	10
Number of Council/Committee worksessions staffed	NA	NA	NA	22	18	24

**Inputs:**

Expenditures, excluding independent audit (\$000)	579	582	655	719	673	730
Independent audit contract (\$000)	215	323	294	282	296	290
Workyears	7.8	8.0	8.0	8.3	8.3	8.0

**Notes:**

<sup>a</sup>As part of OLO's approved FY05 Work Plan, OLO will review the implementation of Council action on two OLO reports completed in FY02.

<sup>b</sup>The FY01 survey by OLO did not assess satisfaction with the working relationship with OLO staff.

<sup>c</sup>OLO identifies target completion dates when the Council adopts the annual OLO Work Program. The target is an estimate based on information available at the beginning of the fiscal year. A number of outside factors affect project completion dates, such as other OLO projects or priorities and cooperation from other agencies and jurisdictions.

<sup>d</sup>These figures include all OLO personnel and operating expenditures, excluding the independent audit contract. The cost per final report submitted varies significantly from year to year, depending on the number and complexity of the projects assigned.

**EXPLANATION:**

OLO completed 11 projects during FY04. Topics OLO studied during FY04 included pre-employment background check practices across County agencies; an evaluation of the Bethesda Urban Partnership; the system for inspection, maintenance, and repair of Fire and Rescue Service vehicles; long-range and strategic plans developed by County Government Departments; the governance structure of Fire and Rescue Services in neighboring counties; Montgomery County Public Schools' spending on special education services; the County Government's capacity and future plans for ensuring access for Limited English Proficient persons to local government services; and the County's efforts to increase recycling in the non-residential sector. OLO also managed the audits of the County Government and the Volunteer Fire and Rescue Corporations financial statements, including managing the process to select outside auditors for the next four-year audit engagement.

The latest member performance survey from the National Association of Local Government Auditors (NALGA) provides data for comparison with OLO. The NALGA survey<sup>\*</sup> found that respondents spent 74% of available time on direct audit tasks, completed 64% of engagements or projects by the target completion date, and had a cost per audit hour of \$44 in FY02. For comparison, in FY04 OLO spent 90% of available time on Work Program assignments, completed 88% of assignments within one month of the target completion date, and had a cost per project hour of \$43.

<sup>\*</sup>National Association of Local Government Auditors, "Report on NALGA's Benchmarking and Best Practices Survey for Fiscal Year 2002," October 2002.

**PROGRAM PARTNERS IN SUPPORT OF OUTCOMES:**

County Council and staff, County Government, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Montgomery College, Montgomery County Public Schools, Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, other jurisdictions, consultants.

**MAJOR RELATED PLANS AND GUIDELINES:**

Chapter 29A Montgomery County Code; Council Resolution 14-607, FY01 Work Program for OLO; Council Resolution 14-965, FY02 Work Program for OLO; Council Resolution 14-1395, FY03 Work Program for OLO; Council Resolution 15-281, FY04 Work Program for OLO; Council Resolution 15-710, FY05 Work Program for OLO.